

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
64.	Section L, L.14	Proposal Preparation Instructions – Volume II	L-20 and L-21	L.14, Page L-20 and L-21. If the NNSA M&O reimbursement costs are counted as a subcontract, this will make achieving 65% of subcontracted costs for small business challenging. Would DOE consider excluding the NNSA M&O reimbursement from the subcontracting equation?	No. It is expected the Offeror will subcontract 22.75% of the total estimated value of the contract except for fee and IDIQ CLINs. This percentage is 65% of the 35% of total dollars to be subcontracted.
65.	Section L, Attachment L-8	Assumptions	L-59 to L-76	In some cases, the word “burdened” is used in conjunction with DOE-provided \$ values for the EM Contractor to include as a plugged number in its cost estimate for services it will perform and in other cases it is not. Please confirm that all \$ values in Attachment L-8 that are provided in Attachment L-8 are fully burdened.	The RFP will be amended to provide clarity in Section L, Attachment L-8.
66.	Section L, Attachment L-8	Assumptions	L-59 to L-76	Please confirm that the \$ values provided for reimbursement to the NNSA M&O are inclusive of all costs to be paid to the M&O for those services (markup, fringe, any fee(s), etc.).	See posted Q&A 65.
67.	L.18(b)	Proposal Preparation Instructions, Volume III – Cost/Price Proposal	L-34	Under Instructions – Cost and Fee Proposal, paragraph (b) it states that the offeror shall not propose its own WBS structure (including adding to or aggregating PWS elements). Would DOE Allow for each PWS level to contain 2 characters? This would allow a preceding 0 to be added to the single digit PWS’, allowing organization of the cost tables and schedule as presented in the RFP. For example, C.1.1.10 would become C.01.01.10.	No. See also Q&A 58.

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
68.	Section L, Attachment L-8	How does the offeror classify and price hazardous waste as there is no category for it in the L-8 assumption or on the cost sheets	L-69	The DOE-provided assumption regarding “Waste Processing Cost and Waste Quantities, Retrieved, Processed, and Dispositioned by Government Fiscal Year (GFY)” lists five waste categories. A hazardous or RCRA waste category is not included in these five, however other sections of the RFP (Attachment L-8, page L-66; C.1.1; C.11.2.2, Table 1) as well as reference documents (IRs, SIRs, etc.) identify hazardous waste generation resulting from remedial activities. What classification should the offeror use for Hazardous (RCRA) waste?	<p>The estimates of waste volumes were only provided for those odd categories that are separate from the RCRA wastes. RCRA wastes are to be considered a separate category that is derived from the proposed technical approach to the remediation activities. Those categories provided are to fill-in the gap where no information is available for the listed categories.</p> <p>However, the RFP, Section L, Assumptions, L-8 will be amended to provide a waste quantity estimate for the RCRA waste category. TSCA waste will be clarified to reflect the predominant contributor to the waste stream.</p>

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
69.	Attachment L-8	Assumption for Waste Processing Cost and Waste Quantities Retrieved, Processed, and Dispositioned by Government Fiscal Year (GFY)	L-69	<p>Attachment L-8, Assumption for Waste Processing Cost and Waste Quantities Retrieved, Processed, and Dispositioned by Government Fiscal Year (GFY), states that, “The Offeror shall assume that the remediation and demolition wastes will be representative of the radiological waste streams that will require disposition. The Offeror shall assume that the following total waste volumes by waste classification have to be disposed: * LLW: 7000 Cubic Meters * MLLW: 9000 Cubic Meters * TSCA: 1000 Cubic Meters * UNIVERSAL WASTES: 500 Cubic Meters * INDUSTRIAL WASTES: 1500 Cubic Meters.”</p> <p>a. Is the waste produced from PWS C.4, CH TRU Waste Disposition, included in the quantities listed above?</p> <p>b. Are the quantities and waste types described above inclusive of all of the other primary and secondary waste-related assumptions described elsewhere in Attachment L-8?</p> <p>c. Are the quantities and waste types listed in Attachment L-8 assumptions for the entire period of performance including options?</p>	See responses to Q&A’s 35 and 68.

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
70.	L.18(l)(ix)	Waste Processing Cost and Waste Quantities Retrieved, Processed and Dispositioned by Government Fiscal Year (GFY)	L-37	<p>Section L.18(l)(ix), Waste Processing Cost and Waste Quantities Retrieved, Processed and Dispositioned by Government Fiscal Year (GFY), states that “In order to fully understand the Offerors cost for waste processing, the Offeror shall provide, for each of the PWS sections stated below, (1) the total quantities by GFY identified in cubic meters and (2) a separate computation showing the unit rate(s) for each GFY composed of the costs per cubic meter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• C.4.1.3 NNSA Owned Newly-Generated CH-TRU, and• C.4.1.7 Mixed Low-Level Waste and Low-Level Disposal.” <p>a. For C.4.1.3 does this include TRU, and secondary waste streams?</p> <p>b. The PWS section entitled “Mixed Low-Level Waste and Low-Level Disposal” is numbered C.4.1.8. Is the second bullet intended to reference PWS section C.4.1.7 entitled “Other Retrievals and Remediation”?</p>	See Q69 and Q&A’s 35 and 68.

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
71.	C.3.4.9 and C.4.9	C.3.4.9 Waste Management and C.4.9 Waste and Waste Analysis and Control	C-30, C- 62	Question: The scope defined in Section C.3.4.9 also appears to be defined in Section C.4.9. What is the scope difference between these two sections?	<p>Sections C.3.4.9 and C.4.9 are very different work scopes. C.3.4.9 is a program for managing wastes: planning, procedures, certifications, container suppliers, qualified people, manifesting requirements and inspections, subcontracts to ship waste, and verification of the final disposition of shipped wastes.</p> <p>C.4.9 is only for TRU waste management within the TSDF at Area G and the tracking of the inventory and knowledge about the TRU wastes. This C.4.9 TRU waste program uses the processes, people, manifests, possible subcontracts, etc. of the waste management program from C.3.4.9.</p> <p>No change to the RFP is necessary.</p>
72.	C.4/C.4.3.2	Above Ground Container Retrieval, Handling and Storage Operations, bullets 2, 6 and 7.	C-59/60	Question: Bullets 2, 6 & 7 refer to RANT,” if RANT is continuing to be used, or another facility providing this function”. Since road closures are the responsibility of the LLCC contractor is there a preferred alternative to RANT being considered?	RANT is being used by the NNSA M&O Contractor to perform the functions identified. There is NO known alternative to RANT.
73.	C.4/C.4.5	Facility and Equipment Maintenance	C-61	Question: An estimate of maintenance cost for TA-54, Area G is provided for the bidders in Attachment L-8 as \$15 million per year but referenced to section 3.8.3. Does this estimate include the items listed in section C.4.5?	Yes, the maintenance cost of the TA-54 portion (\$15M) is included in the scope of C.3.8.3. The items from C.4.5 are included in the provided assumption of \$15M, but the \$15M assumption does not include everything outside of TA-54.

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
74.	J.Attachment.J6. 6(b)	Interfaces with NNSA managing and operating contractor systems and services - LAMCAS	J-6-3	Question: Subsection (b) of item 6 says “The Contractor shall sample wastes for nuclear material content and submit this information into LAMCAS with the records for release of material off-site.” Both CH-TRU and other radioactive waste packages go through certified NDA protocols to determine SNM content of the waste package. Is the NDA values derived from this certified protocol acceptable for use to meet the sampling requirement?	Yes.
75.	n/a	AMWTP	n/a	From December 2008 to today, AMWTP successfully received and processed radioactive waste, including CH TRU, from 11 other DOE sites. Similarly, the AMWTP may be suitable for processing a portion of the CH TRU waste from LANL, but talks of the potential closure of AMWTP make this option unclear. To ensure that all offerors use the same basis from which to prepare their proposals, what assumptions should offerors make regarding the availability of AMWTP in the future? For example, should we assume that the AMWTP will be closed after 2018 and unavailable to accept radioactive materials for processing or should we assume that the AMWTP will continue and therefore be potentially available for materials processing through some future date beyond 2018?	The Offeror’s Technical and Management Proposal shall be based on the RFP requirements for on-site processing within on-site LANL facilities.

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
76.	C.3.4.7	Other Environmental Sampling and Monitoring Programs	C-29	<p>This section requires collecting a wide range of environmental data in support of NNSA M&O Contractor reports.</p> <p>Will the DOE provide an estimate of the types and numbers of soil, air, and biota surveillance and monitoring samples required?</p>	<p>Although the intent was always to report (to NNSA M&O) the environmental data we would normally collect as part of the EM mission work scope (nest box on LANL), it might be possible that a request comes in for some other data that would be best suited to collect (e.g., nest box off LANL). This type of information is not currently known.</p>
77.	C.3.7.1	Personal Property Management	C-39	<p>This first paragraph requires the Contractor to properly control classified equipment and material, however Attachment J-12, Government-Furnished Property List, does not include an indication of which items are classified.</p> <p>Will the DOE identify prior to the proposal due date what equipment and material is classified, and the level of classification?</p>	<p>None of the equipment to be assigned to the LLCC Contractor is currently known to be classified. Therefore, will not have to be controlled as classified at this time.</p> <p>The RFP will be amended to state “if applicable”.</p>

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
78.	L-8	Assumptions: Campaigns and PWS Section Cross Walk to Contract Periods	L-77	<p>The assumption for PWS element C.8 in the table states an anticipated 50% reduction in effort for each option period. It is not clear whether the 50% reduction for each option period is relative to the Base Period, or rather the 50% reduction is cumulative from Option Period 1 to Option Period 2, which would make the Option Period 2 effort 25% compared to the Base Period.</p> <p>Is the reduction in effort for Option Period 2 compared to the Base Period and thus would be 50% of the Base Period?</p>	The cascading reductions are correct. The RFP will be revised to provide clarification.
79.	Section C.12.2.4, Attachment J-10, and Attachment L-8 Assumptions	Conflict in MDA H Scope of Work	C-122 J-10-32 L-68 L-80	<p>Section C.12.2.4 on Page C-122 clearly states: “It is <u>not anticipated that the MDA-H corrective measures will be implemented during this contract period.</u>”</p> <p>Attachment J-10, Page J-10-32 states: “Campaign P -- MDA-H Remedy, (<u>completion of the final remedy and submittal and approval of the Corrective Measures Implementation Report shall be completed in Option Period 2.</u>)”</p> <p>Attachment L-8, Page L-68 states: “The Offeror shall assume the <u>construction of the 1/3-acre ET cover will not be radiological work.</u>”</p> <p>Attachment L-8 Page L-80 states: Anticipated to start with CME development at the beginning of Option Period 1 and statement of basis support late in Option Period 1 and <u>complete in Option Period 2.</u></p> <p>Please update J-10 and L-8 to align with Section C of the RFP which clearly states that the construction of the MDA H ET cover (implementation of the remedy/corrective measures) is NOT included in the scope for this contract.</p>	<p>See Q&A #36.</p> <p>The RFP will be amended at C.12.2.4 to match Attachments L-8 and J-10, such that execution of the project “is” included.</p>

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
80.	C.11.2.5	Consent Order Target Description	C-103	Please provide the FY 2018 Target Description for Historical Properties/Upper LA Canyon. The table in Appendix B of the Consent Order does not show the full text, so that only part of the description was provided. Please provide the remainder. Consent Order, Appendix B, Page 1	<p>The Appendix B text for FY2018 target for Historical properties/Upper Los Alamos Canyon is as follows:</p> <p>“Campaign level milestone for completion of all SWMUs/AOCs in Upper LA CAA and development and submittal of the Investigation Report. This report would include those DOE SWMUs on the back-side of private property (including SWMUs cleanup in Former TA-32 and separately reported).</p> <p>Results currently planned to be included in the final invest. rpt for the Upper LA Cyn Aggregate Area”</p>
81.	C.11.2.4	Industrial Waste Lines	C-102	The second paragraph of C.11.2.4 states “the subcontractor shall excavate and dispose of the buried industrial waste lines that run from DP West building slabs to TA-21-257 (Radiological Liquid Waste Facility) and that are included in [Consolidated Unit] TA-21-004(b)-99.” The RFP reference to SWMU 21-004(b)-99 is inconsistent with other reference documents regarding the SWMU designation for the DP West Industrial Waste Lines. The Investigation Work Plan for Delta Prime Site Aggregate Area Delayed Sites (LA-UR-09-6108) shows these industrial waste lines in Consolidated Unit 21-022(b)-99. Please update the RFP to correctly identify the buried waste lines as being in Consolidated Unit 21-022(b)-99.	The RFP will be amended to correct the error.

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
82.	C.11.2.7	Reference Document	C-104	Please provide the document referenced in the last paragraph on the page, "A Phase II work Plan for Lower Sandia Canyon Aggregate Area, LA-UR-14-xxxxx, June 2014."	The document referenced was not actually completed by the LCBC Contractor. The RFP will be amended to require the Contractor to prepare such plan.
83.	C.5.1.7	Hydrogeologic Data Repository and Geologic Framework Model	C-65	What software packages are utilized for the LANL Geologic Framework and the Hydrogeologic Data Repository? Will the successful offeror be required to purchase and maintain licenses for the software in order to maintain these databases and models or will DOE-EM provide the license?	LANL's geologic framework model (GFM) is a series of ~25-30 geohorizons that are interpreted from borehole data and maintained as raster images. They were developed using EarthVision software. The Laboratory maintains a multi-user EarthVision license. Hydrological data are maintained in Environmental Information Management (EIM). These data include strat picks, geophysics data (files), well-construction data, etc. Because LANL uses a multi-user EarthVision license shared among many programs (including non-EM programs), the annual license fee is shared proportionally among the users. Because the Contractor will not be part of LANS and likely will not qualify for license sharing, the Contractor shall obtain any necessary license to use the existing shared system.

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
84.	Section J, Attachment J-12	Portable Radiation Monitoring Instruments		Attachment J-12, Government Furnished Property, does not list any portable radiation monitoring instrumentation. Will the instruments currently being used by the Bridge Contractor transfer to the LLCC?	Yes, there will be a list of portable radiation monitoring equipment that will be identified to be turned over to the Contractor. However, this equipment tends to be swapped out, replaced, excessed, removed for calibration, etc. on a frequent basis. The Contractor will be responsible for negotiating which pieces will be transferred during the Transition Period property inventory, which will be used to update Attachment J-12 shortly after award.

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
85.	L.17 (h), L.19	Past Performance Questionnaire	L-30 - 3; L-42	<p>Section L.19 (Time and Place Offers are Due) states that <i>"All Offers required by this solicitation are due at the date, time, and place identified on the Standard Form (SF 33), Solicitation, Offer and Award (See Section A, Block 9)."</i></p> <p>The instruction in L.17 requires the offeror to <i>"...provide the Past Performance Questionnaire contained in Attachment L-4 to Section L and the completed Past Performance and Experience Reference Information Form in Attachment L-3 to Section L to each of the contract references."</i> This latter instruction appears to be in conflict with L.19 since it requires the completion and delivery of a part of a proprietary proposal response in advance of the date specified in the SF33.</p> <p>To avoid this conflict, and the release of sensitive proprietary competitive information into an uncontrolled environment, we recommend that the DOE remove the requirement for the delivery of Attachment L-3 to the contract references.</p>	<p>The RFP will be amended at L.17(h) to remove the requirement for delivery of the Attachment L-3 to the contract references.</p> <p>See also Q&A's 29, 61, 86.</p>

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
86.	L.17 (h)	Past Performance Questionnaire	L-30 - 31	<p>Section L.17 requires that the offeror "<i>...shall request that clients return the Past Performance Questionnaire directly to DOE by mail or electronic means to the address identified below no later than two weeks prior to the date for receipt of proposals.</i>".</p> <p>This requirement places a burden of early delivery of a required proposal section (Attachment L-4) in advance of the rest of the proposal, and is inconsistent with the instructions in other DOE comparable RFPs such as Savannah River Site Liquid Waste Services. This requires final identification of past performance experience and completion of multiple Attachment L-4s well in advance of the proposal delivery date (to allow the reference to analyze and complete the form), and places an unnecessary restriction on offerors and potentially affects the quality of submissions.</p> <p>We request that the last sentence in L.17 (h) be reworded to read "<i>The Offeror shall request that clients return the Past Performance Questionnaire directly to DOE by mail or electronic means to the address identified below no later than the date for receipt of proposals.</i>"</p>	<p>No change to the RFP is required.</p> <p>DOE would like the information early so that we can start working on pulling past performance information in advance of receiving proposals, DOE understands the Offeror has no control over if and when a client will return a PPQ and that's why the RFP stated "Offeror shall request . . . ". All other parts of the offer/proposal are required by the proposal due date.</p>